



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.ospto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/649,270	08/28/2000	Lawrence A. Crowl	SUN1P380/P4501	SUN1P380/P4501 6759	
22434 7	590 11/17/2004		EXAMINER		
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			VU, TUAN A		
P.O. BOX 778 BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
·			2124		

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	The state of the s				
Advisory Action	09/649,270	CROWL ET AL.					
·	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Tuan A Vu	2124					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 08 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:							
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);							
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without cance	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ms.				
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	l be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment				
5.⊠ The a)□ affidavit, b)□ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for application in condition for allowance because: Set		sidered but does NO	OT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,4-10,12-16 and 19-22</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
☐ The drawing correction filed on is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	•					
10. Other:							

Continuation of 5, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants have submitted that Examiner has equated program symbols to tokens and non-programs symbols to vocabulary words. Examiner likes to clarify that the non-programs symbols are pointer information such as tag, pointer reference being stored in step 222 of Fig. 8 of Unger and would refer applicants back to the Office action where all this has been presented. Applicants' point on Unger's not teaching base symbol and reduced-size format should be assessed in the context combining Ainon and Storer to Under whose suggestion as to use differential encoding has been set forth in the rejection referring Unger. The use of a base and appending thereto some form of reduced size encoding is provided by the Ainon's vocabulary group of base symbols and Storer's substituting a difference w/ pointer representation. Both of these limitations are suggested in the known techniques seen in Run-Lenghth or Lempel-Ziv, Huffman shown by Unger's as established in the Off. Action. Compacting pointer representation in Storer is reminiscent of producing a compressed package with stored pointer information as suggested in Fig. 8 by Unger. In all, what Unger does not explicitly disclose can be reconstructed via an obviousness rationale combining the base symbol by Ainon and the differential encoding by Storer, because Unger clearly suggests the reduction of size using the above techniques; and it does not require much undue investigation or research for one ordinary skill in the art to establish the close relation b/w a base symbol and a differential part being appended to such base in order to cut down on the overall original program symbols as disclosed by Unger in view of those known techniques. Hence, the arguments by Applicants founded on the wrong understanding of Examiner's matching of program symbol or non-program symbols to the reference has not been convincing; therefore do not amount to persuading the Examiner to reconsider the merits of the Off. Action. The claims as of now are not deemed allowable because the techniques for compressing as claimed reflect variances in prior art; and the fact that symbols being compressed come from programming languages are only at best an obvious intended use...

Kacan- Che.

KAKALI CHAKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100